Potamilus has been used in the United States Fish and Wildlife Endangered Species Program since 1974. Not only is it used for two species of *Potamilus* on the federal endangered species list but is used in a number of state endangered species lists as well. Since *Potamilus* is listed on the United States federal list of endangered species it has been picked up by the IUCN Red Data Book on endangered invertebrate species (IUCN, 1986).

The American Malacological Union and the Council of Systematic Malacologists working with the American Fisheries Society produced a checklist of the molluscan fauna of North America north of Mexico based on all available published literature. Several preliminary lists were widely circulated and a draft version published (American Malacological Union, 1985). All submitted comments were carefully considered. The first edition of this checklist was published as a special publication of the American Fisheries Society (Turgeon et al., 1988). This checklist uses *Potamilus*.

This survey illustrates that the use of *Potamilus* in the published literature is in fact widespread. This is in direct contrast to the impression given by Gordon (BZN **47**: 20, para. 8).

The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked:

(1) not to use its plenary powers to suppress the name *Potamilus* Rafinesque, 1818;
(2) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology the name *Potamilus* Rafinesque, 1818 (gender: masculine), type species by subsequent designation by Morrison (1969) *Unio alatus* Say, 1817;
(3) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the name *alatus* Say, 1817, as published in the binomen *Unio alatus* (specific name of the type species of *Potamilus* Rafinesque, 1818).

Additional References

American Malacological Union. 1985. Suggested draft list of common names for mollusks occurring from America north of Mexico. *Shells and Sealife*, **17**(2): 45–85.

International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources. 1986. *1986 IUCN Red List of Threatened Animals.* 105 pp. International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, U.K.

Turgeon, D.D., Bogan, A.E., Coan, E.V., Emerson, W.K., Lyons, W.G., Pratt, W.L., Roper, C.F.E., Scheltema, A., Thompson, F.G. & Williams, J.D. 1988. *Common and scientific names of aquatic invertebrates from the United States and Canada: Mollusks.* American Fisheries Society Special Publication no. 16. vii, 277 pp., 12 pls. Bethesda.

Comments on the proposed conservation of the specific names of *Aphrodita imbricata* Linnaeus, 1767 (currently *Harmothoe imbricata*) and *Aphrodita minuta* Fabricius, 1780 (currently *Pholoe minuta*) (Annelida, Polychaeta)

(Case 2452; see BZN **46**: 22–24)

(1) Mary E. Petersen
Zoological Museum, University of Copenhagen, Universitetsparken 15, DK-2100 Copenhagen o, Denmark

Chambers & Heppell have pointed out that the specific name *imbricata* is threatened by the senior subjective synonym *Aphrodita lepidota* Pallas, 1766, and that *A. minuta*

Fabricius, 1780 is preoccupied by the senior primary homonym *Aphrodita minuta* Pennant, 1777.

I see no reason not to support conservation of the specific name *imbricata* as long as *lepidota* is believed to represent the same taxon. However, I suggest that a conditional suppression of *lepidota* would be preferable as this would leave the name *lepidota* available should it become desirable to recognize specific differences between some of the forms currently being referred to *imbricata*. As indicated below, this is not unlikely.

Harmothoe imbricata is generally considered to be well known and widely distributed. Critical examination of other such species (e.g. *Capitella capitata* by Grassle & Grassle, 1976; *Terebellides stroemii* by Williams, 1984; *Chaetopterus variopedatus* by Petersen, 1984 and in preparation) has revealed the 'well known' name in each case to be used for several species and has resulted in recognition of additional taxa, often those previously considered junior synonyms. That characters may be found at all levels, from behavioral to ultrastructural, has been elegantly shown by Westheide & Rieger (1987) for three very similar species of the *Microphthalmus listensis* complex, previously believed to be a single species.

Most authors have remarked on the great biological and morphological variation shown by specimens identified as *H. imbricata*, which is claimed to be cosmopolitan, but no one has yet undertaken a critical revision of the species on a worldwide or even northern European basis. We therefore still do not know how many distinct taxa are being referred to this name. The species undoubtedly varies greatly in color pattern and ornamentation of the scales, but it has also been reported to show variation in spawning season and reproductive biology.

In European waters, Rasmussen (1956; the Isefjord, Denmark) and Daly (1972; Cullercoats, England) found *H. imbricata* to have large eggs brooded under the elytra, whereas Cazaux (1968; Arcachon, France) found small eggs freely spawned. This suggests that two or more taxa are present here; reports of the taxon from other areas (e.g. Izuka, 1912, Japan; Blake, 1975, northern California) may represent something else again.

Linnaeus' original description of *imbricata* (type locality Iceland) does not mention any specific color pattern, only that the color pattern is variable. Variations similar to those described for *H. imbricata* as presently defined also occur in other scaleworms, e.g. *H. elisabethae* (McIntosh, 1900) (M.E. Petersen, unpublished observations).

The type locality of *lepidota* is between England and Belgium, in the southern North Sea, and Arcachon is on the Bay of Biscay (coast of France). If some of the free-spawning '*imbricata*' from Arcachon fit the description of *lepidota* and can be distinguished from Icelandic *imbricata* that brood their eggs, *imbricata* could be restricted to a brooding form (which seems to be the type of breeding biology most often reported for this species) and *lepidota* to a free-spawning form. Any redescription of *lepidota* should, of course, be based on material from as close to the type locality as possible, and not from Arcachon. Until a critical comparison of these forms has been made, I do not feel it is desirable to suppress *lepidota* unconditionally. It is possible that more than one taxon will be distinguished and I cannot see how conditional suppression could endanger nomenclatural stability.

Chambers & Heppell point out that the name *Pholoe minuta* (Fabricius, 1780) is threatened by the senior homonym *Aphrodita minuta* Pennant, 1777, erected for a species from off Anglesey, Wales (the Irish Sea). Revisions in progress (Chambers, see BZN **46**: 23; M.E. Petersen, in preparation) have shown that *P. minuta* has been misinterpreted by most later workers and thus is not as widespread as believed (Petersen, 1983, pp. 64–65). Although there are still some points that need clarification and require examination of newly collected material from the type locality (an attempt to obtain such is currently being made), the species is described in some detail, and it is desirable that the name *minuta* be retained for Fabricius' species.

It is really not clear whether Pennant merely created what he considered a more appropriate name for *lepidota* or whether he thought he had a new species. His description of *minuta* states only that the species is an 'APH. with small scales; slender; not an inch long.' (Pennant, 1777, p. 45, pl. 24, fig. 29; 1812, p. 87, pl. 26, fig. 4) and, together with the figure, could either be interpreted as a *Pholoe* or a polynoid, although the latter is the more likely. If a polynoid, the species could belong to any of a number of genera, and is either indeterminable or at best a junior synonym of *lepidota*. I fully agree with Chambers and Heppell that recognition of *minuta* Pennant serves no useful purpose, and I support their request for its suppression.

Acknowledgements

Susan Chambers (Edinburgh), Anthea Gentry (ICZN Secretariat), and the Department of Mollusks, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., provided help with the early literature. The manuscript was read by Dr Claus Nielsen and Danny Eibye-Jacobsen, Copenhagen, whose comments and suggestions are gratefully acknowledged.

Additional references

Blake, J.A. 1975. The larval development of Polychaeta from the northern California Coast. III. Eighteen species of Errantia. *Ophelia*, **14**: 23–84.

Cazaux, C. 1968. Étude morphologique de développement larvaire d'annélides Polychètes. (Bassin d'Arcachon). I. Aphroditidae, Chrysopetalidae. *Archives de Zoologie Expérimentale et Générale*, **109**: 477–543.

Daly, J.M. 1972. The maturation and breeding biology of *Harmothoe imbricata* (Polychaeta: Polynoidae). *Marine Biology*, **12**(1): 53–66.

Grassle, J.P. & Grassle, J.F. 1976. Sibling species in the marine pollution indicator *Capitella* (Polychaeta). *Science*, **192**: 567–569.

Izuka, A. 1912. The errantiate Polychaeta of Japan. *Journal of the College of Science, Imperial University of Tokyo*, **30**(2): 1–262.

Pennant, T. 1812. *British Zoology*. A new (fifth) edition, vol. 4, 380 pp., 95 pls. London.

Petersen, M.E. 1983. *Pholoe minuta*: a cosmopolitan species or a victim of the 'Characteristic Species Disease'? Pp. 64–65 *in*: *Programme of Polychaete Conference, Australian Museum, July 1983*. (Unpublished programme abstract.)

Petersen, M.E. 1984. *Chaetopterus variopedatus* (Annelida: Polychaeta): Another victim of the 'characteristic species' disease. *American Zoologist*, **24**(3): 62A.

Rasmussen, E. 1956. Faunistic and biological notes on marine invertebrates III. The reproduction and larval development of some polychaetes from the Isefjord, with some faunistic notes. *Biologiske Meddelelser af Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab*, **23**(1): 1–84.

Westheide, W. & Rieger, R.M. 1987. Systematics of the amphiatlantic *Microphthalmus-listensis*-species-group (Polychaeta: Hesionidae): Facts and concepts for reconstruction of phylogeny and speciation. *Zeitschrift für Zoologische Systematik und Evolutionsforschung*, **25**(1): 12–39.

Williams, S.J. 1984. The status of *Terebellides stroemi* (Polychaeta; Trichobranchidae) as a cosmopolitan species, based on a worldwide morphological survey, including description of new species. Pp. 118–142 *in* P.A. Hutchings (Ed.), *Proceedings of the First International Polychaete Conference, Sydney*. The Linnean Society of New South Wales.